



EUROSPHERE

COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Work Package 4.1 Report, 2011

**CITIZENS' IMPACT ON THE
ARTICULATION
OF EUROPEAN PUBLIC SPHERE:
Explaining Citizens' Attitudes to European Integration**

**Hakan Sicakkan
Yolanda Zografova**

This paper can be downloaded without charge from:
<http://eurospheres.org/publications/workpackage-reports/>
ISSN 1890-5986

EUROSPHERE ONLINE WORKING PAPER SERIES

Title: WP4.1 – Citizens’ Impact on the Articulation of European Public Sphere:
Explaining Citizens’ Attitudes to European Integration
Author: H. Sicakkan
Y. Zografova
This version: October 2011
Webpage: <http://eurospheres.org/publications/workpackage-reports/>

© EUROSPHERE, 2011

<http://eurospheres.org>

© 2011 by authors

All rights reserved.

*Short sections of text, not to exceed
two paragraphs, may be quoted without
explicit permission provided that full credit,
including notice, is given to the source.*

*The views expressed in this paper do not
necessarily reflect those of the EUROSPHERE Project.*

*The statement of purpose for the
EUROSPHERE Online Working Paper Series
is available from the EUROSPHERE working papers website,
<http://eurospheres.org/publications/workpackage-reports/>*

Author Contact Information:

Yolanda Zografova

Institute of Population and Human Studies,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
zografova@abv.bg

Hakan G. Sicakkan

The University of Bergen
Dep’t of Comparative Politics
Norway
Hakan.Sicakkan@isp.uib.no

ISSN 1890-5986 (online)

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Mobility Model – Citizens’ Co-otherness.....	2
1.2 The Participation Model – Citizens’ Patterns of Involvement.....	3
1.3 The Belonging Model – Citizens Multiple Belongings	4
2 Constructing indicators of the three models.....	6
2.1 Constructing Indicators of the Participation Model	6
2.2 Constructing Indicators of the Belonging Model.....	7
2.3 Constructing Indicators of the Co-otherness Model	8
3 Is Co-otherness a Relevant Concept?	10
References	14

Explaining Citizens' Attitudes to European Integration

Hakan G. Sicakkan and Yolanda Zografova

1 Introduction

In this paper, we explore the possibilities for explaining attitudes to the EU and European integration. Our focus here is the relative explanatory powers of three models: The mobility model (co-otherness), the belonging model, and the participation model.

Previous research on attitudes to the European Union have contributed to our understanding of the subject matter primarily with a point of departure in theories stressing the importance of citizens' value orientations and economic interests, as well as utilitarian approaches including other types of interests.

Value-oriented theories claim that values and cognitive capacities affect a citizen's possibility to develop opinions about distant entities (Inglehart 1970) like the EU. The utilitarian approach, on the other hand, hypothesizes that it is cost-benefit calculations that motivate citizens' attitudes (Tucker et al. 2002, Hooghe and Marks 2005). The hypothesis of this paper is that, whereas these approaches do explain in large measure citizens' attitudes to the EU in both old and new member states, the explanatory variables that they use need explanation themselves.

In this connection, the relation that Inglehart establishes between value orientations and cognitive skills is interesting and promising in the context of the Eurosphere project, which has a focus on "mobility of minds". However, Inglehart's operationalization of cognitive capabilities as levels of political awareness and communication skills does not ideally correspond to the theoretical concept of "cognitive capabilities" in the globalized world. The processes of globalization and transnationalization have brought new cognitive skills into individuals' lives. The most important of these new skills is a new kind of mental mobility, which enables individuals to rapidly shift between different references of identification – the Self, the Other, and the Co-other (Sicakkan 2003, 2006); this without necessarily abandoning the reality of the Self, which is different from the Rawlsian assumption of "the veil of ignorance". This was formulated by Ulrich Beck as "ability to treat oneself as others".

The argument in this part of our paper is that it is this new cognitive skill that motivates people's political communication across and beyond the established local, regional, and national contexts. The aim of this paper is to empirically document the relevance of this premise, which is the first step of our research. The second step of our research, which is not presented in Chapter 2, focuses, among other things, on the factors that trigger the development of this new skill (e.g., living in a context of complex diversity, participation in multiple types of organizations and political activities, consumption of media news, internet use, etc) and its resultant effect on citizens' attitudes to the EU.

In the following, we first present the main assumptions of these three explanatory models. Thereafter, we construct the quantitative indicators of these models by using principal components analyses. Finally, we regress the factors obtained in the previous stage on citizens' attitudes to EU integration. Citizens' attitudes to EU integration have been operationalized in terms of their trust to the European Parliament and their opinions concerning how the European integration should go, both of which were measured in the European Social Survey rounds of 2002, 2004, and 2006.

1.1 The Mobility Model – Citizens' Co-otherness

The first model – **the mobility model** – asserts that it is physical and mental mobility of individuals (*co-otherness*) that enable them to think beyond the limitations of their identities and belongings and beyond the alternatives available in their immediate surroundings. This theory was tested, quantitatively and qualitatively, by Daniel Lerner in 1960s in the context of the modernization processes in six Middle East countries and also qualitatively by the GLOCALMIG project in 2003 in six European countries.

This paper conducts comparative analyses of the impact of citizens' co-otherness (the mobility model) on their attitudes to the EP on a broader data basis. The comparative analysis assesses the degree of co-otherness with respect to indicators of mental mobility between different references of identification.

Quite many studies on information-processing patterns of behavior have proven the crucial influence of cognitive mechanisms on regulation of behavior (Huesman, 1998, Anderson & Bushmann, 2002, Zografova, 2008). This improves schematic knowledge of individuals towards enlargement of their social representations of the current EU processes and also of other individuals and groups, who are more likely to interact due to their higher level of mobility. People who enlarge their schematic thinking are more willing to find similarities between themselves and other people and similarity fosters altruism (Turner et al

1994) and also empathy, co-otherness. In other words, the principle of diversity turns into a tool for construction of social knowledge of an increasing number of individuals.

Negative aspects of mobility of individuals within the context of everyday situations and problem-solving are usually manifested by drifting away from normative principles, by lack of interest in priorities of the macro-social system. Such an example is the development (via mobility) and the expression of positive attitudes and tolerance towards out-groups – by ethnic, racial, religious, etc. indicators and simultaneous non-acceptance of an individual belonging to the respective ethnic group, race, religion, etc., as a fellow-citizen, a neighbor, a friend, or a husband/wife under definite conditions.

1.2 The Participation Model – Citizens’ Patterns of Involvement

The second explanatory model – **the participation model** – asserts that a high level of participation in certain combinations of different types of communicative public spaces (e.g., ethnic, national, transnational, European, etc) leads to more positive attitudes to diversity, the EP, and the EPS.

Here, we conduct comparative analyses of the impact of citizens’ patterns of participation / involvement on their attitudes to the EP. The comparative analysis will assess the degree of participation and the areas of involvement as well as the types of political actors and public spaces that individuals attend to or claim an affiliation with.

What is the importance of citizens’ participation/involvement? Above all, involvement in various communicative public spaces breeds diverse social representations in individuals. And through social representations (communicated by the media) new knowledge, concepts, myths, and truths, such as the common sense, are transmitted and acquired, as well as new information of other groups, of social processes, norms, rules, changes, etc. Via representations the collective views of important aspects of reality are formed. And in turn they regulate behavior of large social strata. Social representations prove to be a powerful tool for development of public communicative spaces and of EPS, as far as they embed the collective consciousness (Durkheim, 1994) moreover, “our overall behavior is also a product of its representation” (Moscovici, 1988). A large part of our social representations are fostered by the media and far less information we obtain through our immediate relationships and through the social world. Categorization processes and input of new content into ready-to-use schemas, stereotypes, and prototypes enable the transformation of unfamiliar things into familiar and safe objects. By exchange of information – facts, evaluations, intentions – individuals mature a common standpoint, which dominates thinking of many people /ibid/.

1.3 The Belonging Model – Citizens Multiple Belongings

The third model – **the belonging model** – asserts that the strength, type, and different intersections of identities (e.g., ethnic, religious, gender, national, territorial, trans-national, European, global, etc) have an important impact on citizens' attitudes to the EP. This theory's best known result from European research is probably that "European and national identities are compatible". Another European project (GLOCALMIG) elaborated this finding with in-depth interviews and found which constellations or intersections of identities provide an openness to diversity, the European Union, and the European Public Sphere. This paper conducts comparative analyses of the impact of citizens' belongings on their attitudes to the EP. The comparative analysis will assess the degree of belonging to different identity categories.

One of the most important personality parameters is identity and belongings to different groups. One of the most frequently developed paradigms – Tajfel's Social Identity Theory (SIT) (Tajfel, 1981) – developed into a Self-Categorization Theory by Turner (Turner, 1978), Turner et al (1994) evidences by a large number of studies that self-categorization of individuals to a group (considering that, except a social group, it might be a psychological one) is an important precondition for development of inter-group relations. According to Turner social identity comprises social self-categorization. This leads to the so-called depersonalization – i.e. the more highly individuals appreciate their belonging to a group-social category, the oftener they determine themselves by categories similar to those by which some other individuals do, who associate themselves with the same category determine themselves. Being recognized by the group members, this leads to higher involvement in processes that form shared representations. The social representations are phenomenon at a group level and are "reflection of social processes that take place between members of a social unit" (Raudsepp 2005: 458).

Whereas the last two models assert the significance of the factors that are external to the individual, the first one insists on considering also the creativity and imaginative capacity of individuals as an additional important explanatory factor concerning the formation of EPS.

This paper contributes to the present state of the art by assessing the explanatory powers of these three models by comparing them with each other by using *unintended data* (re-conceptualizations of the already existing three rounds of ESS). It will give indications of which factors of belonging, participation, and mobility are effective in increasing the European citizens' involvement and participation in European level politics as well as in the European Public Sphere.

Background

The interest in EU issues, to political processes, and to enlargement of the EU is determined by a specific type of social influence. The more informative, rather than normative it is, the stronger influence it exerts on citizens' attitudes and the more likely it is to attract them. The more normative and coercive this influence is, the more likely it is to enhance conform behavior (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). Informative influence is determinant of the higher confidence in institutions as it breeds more widespread positive attitudes toward diversity and politics.

According to SIT, citizens are motivated to appraise themselves in a positive manner. Upon association with a group/category they tend to estimate this group/category in a positive manner as well (Brown&Lunt, 2002). Therefore, we hypothesize that the stronger the association of being representatives of the European Community, of the EU, the more likely the citizens are to evaluate the European Community, the EU positively, and also to express attitudes of acceptance of both diversity and EPS.

On comparison between the public opinion evidenced by the ESS and the leaders' opinion on EU polity and diversity and also on the notions of some discrepancies may be expected.

Are citizens able to develop empathy towards out-groups that are not accepted by their social surrounding and culture; how different and strange do we find our emigrants, who left the country, and how foreign they feel themselves abroad – i.e. do citizens not strive to treat as co-others only successful individuals, groups, nations, etc. In fact, this is a possible way to operationalize and analyze the level of open-mindedness.

When low involvement in political voting occurs simultaneously with high involvement in some other processes such as protests, demonstrations, subscriptions listing, etc., then it is likely to observe higher involvement in local communicative spaces, rather than in transnational communicative spaces.

The more similar attitudes towards the EU and its institutions are in a cross-cultural perspective, the more likely it is that the development of EPS is in progress.

We hypothesize that the comparison of data among different survey rounds and years will outline an upward trend in positive attitudes towards diversity, EU institutions and EPS, as well as rising criticism and expectations to both national and EU institutions, particularly the national ones.

Although social contacts and mobility have enlarged in the past years, citizens tend to rely on their own experience yet, as they use accumulated knowledge, representations, stereotypes intrinsic to their in-group (i.e. rather positive attitudes), when they have to think and answer

questions concerning other ethnic communities, religious groups, emigrant minorities, nations, and cultures.

In the following, we will first construct the indicators of the three models by using the variables available in the ESS dataset that comprises a combination of the data collected in the ESS rounds 2002, 2004, and 2006. After this, we run a regression analysis to compare the explanatory powers of these three models. This means that, at this stage of our work, not all of the hypotheses mentioned above are tested in this paper as this is an ongoing work until June 2010. It is important to underline that also the analyses presented here are still at an exploratory stage, and our findings are rather tentative and guiding for further research than being conclusive.

2 Constructing indicators of the three models

The indicators of the three models in this paper have been constructed based on the variables available in the three ESS-rounds of 2002, 2004, and 2006. Data from these three separate rounds were already merged by the ESS consortium. As we aim to infer about the whole European population in the 14 countries¹ analyzed here, we applied a combination of the design weight and population weight in all analyses.

2.1 Constructing Indicators of the Participation Model

A principal components analysis of 7 political participation variables gave two meaningful participation patterns. The first dimension in Table 1 measures the extent to which a citizen is active in the grassroots politics, and the second one measures participation in established political organizations, including also political parties.

¹ Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and the UK. Data about the remaining two countries analyzed in Eurosphere – Bulgaria and Turkey – are not available in these rounds.

Table 1: Indicators of the Participation Model

	Component	
	Grassroots Participation	Organizational Participation
Worked in an organization/association	,476	,358
Worn/displayed campaign badge/sticker	,552	,349
Signed petition	,733	,012
Taken part in lawful public demonstration	,601	,211
Boycotted products	,657	-,124
Worked in political party or action group	,193	,799
Political party member	-,049	,821

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 2: Total Variance Explained – Belonging dimensions

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2,311	33,015	33,015	2,311	33,015	33,015	1,902	27,167	27,167
2	1,212	17,308	50,323	1,212	17,308	50,323	1,621	23,157	50,323
3	,853	12,179	62,502						
4	,772	11,028	73,530						
5	,672	9,605	83,135						
6	,651	9,299	92,434						
7	,530	7,566	100,000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

2.2 Constructing Indicators of the Belonging Model

A principal components analysis of selected belonging variables in the ESS dataset gave two meaningful dimensions. The first dimension has been labeled by us as majority vs. minority belonging. It measures whether a citizen considers himself/herself as belonging to the majority society or to an ethnic minority group. The second dimension measures whether a citizen views himself or herself as belonging to a particular religion or denomination.

Table 3: Indicators of the Belonging Model

	Component	
	Majority vs Minority Member	Member of a Religion
Born in country	,818	,059
Citizen of country	,767	,061
Belong to an ethnic minority group	-,679	-,031
Member of a discriminated group	-,411	,103
Religious belonging	-,032	-,846
Ever belonged to a religion before	-,032	,846

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 4: Total Variance Explained – Belonging Model

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1,901	31,691	31,691	1,901	31,691	31,691	1,889	31,489	31,489
2	1,437	23,944	55,635	1,437	23,944	55,635	1,449	24,146	55,635
3	,983	16,383	72,019						
4	,692	11,533	83,552						
5	,558	9,301	92,853						
6	,429	7,147	100,000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

2.3 Constructing Indicators of the Co-otherness Model

Co-otherness is an important individual feature, which is assumed in Eurosphere to make effective participation and political communication across the variety of existing physical and social/cultural/discursive boundaries in public sphere possible. At the most abstract level, co-otherness means a combination of three things:

Mental ability to imagine and treat others as oneself

Mental ability to imagine / treat oneself as others

Mental ability to rapidly move between the self and the other

In addition, co-otherness also involves another individual characteristic which derives from the above two features: a mental mobility between different references of identification – e.g., between one's own and other people's ethnic, religious, gender, territorial, sexual etc belongings.

Table 5: Indicators of the Co-otherness Model

	Component		
	Self-centred orientation	Co-other orientation	Community-centred orientation
Important to seek adventures and have an exiting life	,704	-,015	-,161
Important to be successful and that people recognice achievements	,670	-,041	,317
Important to seek fun and things that give pleasure	,652	,170	-,099
Important to show abilities and be admired	,636	-,035	,283
Important to have a good time	,626	,222	-,146
Important to try new and different things in life	,618	,291	-,081
Important to be rich, have money and expensive things	,576	-,304	,262
Important to think new ideas and being creative	,488	,364	-,111
Important to make own decisions and be free	,394	,385	,042
Important to understand different people	,098	,654	,064
Important to help people and care for others well-being	,126	,631	,190
Important to be loyal to friends and devote to people close	,149	,629	,184
Important to care for nature and environment	,040	,616	,219
Important that people are treated equally and have equal opportunities	,041	,583	,092
Important to be humble and modest, not draw attention	-,218	,420	,312
Important to behave properly	-,069	,239	,659
Important to do what is told and follow rules	-,018	,020	,656
Important to live in secure and safe surroundings	,024	,212	,605
Important to follow traditions and customs	-,066	,157	,594
Important that government is strong and ensures safety	,046	,249	,586
Important to get respect from others	,385	-,070	,527

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 6: Total Variance Explained (co-otherness)

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4,360	20,760	20,760	4,360	20,760	20,760	3,532	16,820	16,820
2	2,917	13,889	34,649	2,917	13,889	34,649	2,850	13,571	30,391
3	1,864	8,878	43,527	1,864	8,878	43,527	2,759	13,136	43,527
4	,961	4,574	48,101						
21	,426	2,027	100,000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The variables in the ESS dataset do not directly measure these individual features; however, the ESS variables listed under the section "Human Values" can be conceptualized as derivative representations of co-otherness. This is what we did in this paper. The ESS variables used for measuring the consequences of co-otherness are listed in Table 5.

A principle components analysis of the relevant variables in the ESS dataset resulted in three meaningful dimensions. The first dimension measures the degree of citizens' self-centered orientation. The very last dimension measures the degree of citizens' community-centered orientations, that is, the extent to which an individual is willing to give priority to the community interests over his or her own personal interests. The second dimension measures the degree of a citizen's willingness to understand and care for other people, treat them equally, be humble at the same time as himself / herself remaining a free and creative individual. Also care for environment is one of the variables included in this dimension.

These individual characteristics – as the respondents view themselves – are assumed in this paper as distinguishing consequences of the state of co-otherness – that is ability to treat oneself and other equally, which requires also a mental ability to view things from the position of others and to be mentally mobile between these different positions. In the following, the indicators of the three models will be regressed on attitudes to European integration.

3 Is Co-otherness a Relevant Concept?

Results from a regression analysis of attitude to the development of EU polity are presented in Table 7. The regression model includes all the indicators of the three models that are constructed in the previous sections.

The Beta-coefficients and their significance levels testify to very clear results. Except for the variables "belonging to a particular religion" all variables in the model have significant effects. This also means that the belonging, participation, and co-otherness models have explanatory power concerning citizens' attitudes to the EU polity.

However, the relative impact of the co-otherness variable is larger than all the other variables. This means that co-otherness – mental ability to move between different sorts of identity references – explains a great deal when it comes to individuals' possibility to relate to new identity references, like the EU.

Table 7: Regression analysis of participation, belonging, and co-otherness models

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-6,574	,230		-28,564	,000
	Co-other orientation	,120	,004	,106	29,813	,000
2	(Constant)	-5,910	,235		-25,144	,000
	Co-other orientation	,141	,004	,123	32,700	,000
3	Community orientation	-,062	,005	-,051	-13,555	,000
	(Constant)	-6,342	,238		-26,691	,000
	Co-other orientation	,124	,005	,109	27,529	,000
	Community orientation	-,067	,005	-,055	-14,580	,000
4	Self-centered orientation	,038	,003	,045	11,962	,000
	(Constant)	-6,328	,238		-26,579	,000
	Co-other orientation	,125	,005	,109	27,662	,000
	Community orientation	-,068	,005	-,056	-14,277	,000
	Self-centered orientation	,037	,003	,044	11,540	,000
	Belonging: to Majority vs Minority	-,263	,029	-,032	-9,148	,000
	Belonging: to a Particular Religion	,027	,031	,003	,856	,392
5	(Constant)	-6,125	,238		-25,788	,000
	Co-other orientation	,107	,005	,093	23,320	,000
	Community orientation	-,042	,005	-,034	-8,599	,000
	Self-centered orientation	,036	,003	,043	11,429	,000
	Belonging: to Majority vs Minority	-,265	,029	-,033	-9,255	,000
	Belonging: to a Particular Religion	-,016	,031	-,002	-,505	,614
	Participation: Grassroot Politics	,687	,031	,082	22,448	,000
6	(Constant)	-5,931	,237		-24,990	,000
	Co-other orientation	,104	,005	,091	22,841	,000
	Community orientation	-,042	,005	-,035	-8,685	,000
	Self-centered orientation	,036	,003	,043	11,257	,000
	Belonging: to Majority vs Minority	-,274	,029	-,034	-9,553	,000
	Belonging: to a Particular Religion	-,012	,031	-,001	-,385	,700
	Participation: Grassroot Politics	,687	,031	,082	22,476	,000
7	Participation: in Political Parties	,560	,032	,061	17,401	,000
	(Constant)	-5,790	,237		-24,420	,000
	Co-other orientation	,099	,005	,087	21,682	,000
	Community orientation	-,048	,005	-,039	-9,879	,000
	Self-centered orientation	,044	,003	,053	13,722	,000
	Belonging: Majority vs Minority	-,367	,029	-,045	-12,575	,000
	Belonging: Particular Religion	,012	,031	,001	,390	,696
Participation: Grassroot Politics	,674	,031	,081	22,093	,000	
Participation Political Parties	,579	,032	,063	18,015	,000	
Participation: Voting	,505	,032	,058	15,925	,000	

a Dependent Variable: Attitude to the Development of an EU Polity

b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by Combined weight (dweight * pweight)

Table 7: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,106 (a)	,011	,011	13,59078
2	,116 (b)	,013	,013	13,57506
3	,123 (c)	,015	,015	13,56285
4	,128 (d)	,016	,016	13,55580
5	,150 (e)	,023	,022	13,51279
6	,162 (f)	,026	,026	13,48700
7	,171 (g)	,029	,029	13,46546

It may look as if the regression analysis conducted here commits a grand sin. Firstly, the dataset comprises data from three ESS rounds in 2002, 2004, and 2006 (data are not repeated measures). Secondly, there are 14 countries in the analysis. This fact has been accounted for by using population and design weights in all inferences. That is, we chose to ignore the time dimension in order to do an exploration of the possibilities to use the co-otherness model in explaining attitudes to European integration. To assure ourselves of how close we get to a real inference without a panel analysis, we looked at whether there are significant differences between the ESS rounds.

The results of the separate analyses are presented in Table 7. What we find in separate analysis of the samples for different ESS rounds is not so different from what we found above: The co-otherness variable has the largest effect on citizens' attitudes to the EU polity. Inferring from the three separate regression analyses in Table 8, the impact of the co-otherness variable is very high and statistically significant in all ESS rounds.

Table 8: Separate regression analyses for ESS rounds (intermediary models omitted in the table)

ESS round	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Stdized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error	
1	3	(Constant)	-2,569	,278		-9,252	,000
		Co-other orientation	,046	,005	,064	8,669	,000
		Community orientation	-,026	,006	-,033	-4,572	,000
		Self-centered orientation	,025	,004	,046	6,474	,000
		Belonging: to Majority vs Minority	-,012	,035	-,002	-,350	,726
		Participation: Active participation in Grassroot Politics	,109	,036	,021	3,078	,002
		Participation: Active participation in Political Parties	,155	,038	,027	4,123	,000
		Participation: Voting	,115	,038	,020	3,019	,003
	2	3	(Constant)	-7,438	,431		-
		Co-other orientation	,119	,008	,092	14,090	,000
		Community orientation	-,044	,009	-,031	-4,939	,000
		Self-centered orientation	,061	,006	,066	10,773	,000
		Belonging: to Majority vs Minority	-,469	,054	-,050	-8,668	,000
		Participation: Active participation in Grassroot Politics	1,025	,056	,108	18,409	,000
		Participation: Active participation in Political Parties	,806	,058	,078	13,808	,000
		Participation: Voting	,636	,058	,065	11,031	,000
3		3	(Constant)	-6,274	,460		-
		Co-other orientation	,126	,009	,099	14,334	,000
		Community orientation	-,089	,009	-,067	-9,936	,000
		Self-centered orientation	,036	,006	,038	5,708	,000
		Belonging: to Majority vs Minority	-,605	,054	-,071	-	,000
		Participation: Active participation in Grassroot Politics	,807	,059	,087	13,616	,000
		Participation: Active participation in Political Parties	,659	,063	,065	10,528	,000
		Participation: Voting	,689	,060	,073	11,440	,000

a Dependent Variable: Attitude to the Development of an EU Polity

b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by Combined weight (dweight * pweight)

References

- Anderson, C. and B. Bushman, (2002). Human aggression, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 27-51.
- Brown, S.D., Lunt, P. 2002. A genealogy of the social identity tradition: Deleuze & Guattari and social psychology. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41 (1), 1-23
- Deutsch, M and H. Gerard, (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences on individual judgements. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51, 629-636.
- Durkheim, E., (1994). Selected, In Deyanova, L. (ed.), *Critics and Humanism*, Sofia
- Hooghe, L and G. Marks (2005), Calculation, community and cues: public opinion on European integration', *European Union Politics* 6, pp. 419–443.
- Inglehart, R. (1970). Cognitive Mobilization and European Identity. *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 45-70.
- Moscovisi, S. (1988). Notes towards a social description of representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, v.18, № 3, 211-250.
- Raudstepp, M. (2005). Why is so difficult to understand the Theory of Social Representations? *Culture & Psychology*, Vol.11(4) , pp. 455-468.
- Sicakkan, H. (2003). Politics, Wisdom and Diversity. Or Why I don't want to be tolerated? *Norwegian Journal of Migration Research*, 4:32-44.
- Sicakkan HG (2006). Glocal Spaces as Prototypes of a Future Diverse Society: An Exploratory Study in Six European Countries” in Sicakkan&Lithman *What Happens When a Society is Diverse?* Studies in Political Science 30. The Edwin Mellen Press, New York, pp.105-148.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: studies in social Psychology*, Cambridge.
- Tucker, J.A., A.C. Pacek and A.J. Berinsky (2002), Transitional winners and losers: attitudes toward EU membership in post-communist countries, *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (3), pp. 557–571.
- Turner, J., Oakes, P. Haslam, A., B. David (1994). Social identity, self-categorization and a group. *Foreign Psychology* 2, № 2 (4).8-17.
- Turner, J.C. (1978). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In: H. Tajfel (Ed.) *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zografova, Y. (2008). Social-psychological knowledge and development of new conceptions and behaviour models. In: Chobanova, R. (Ed), *Demand for Knowledge in the Process of European Economic Integration*, Institute of Economics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia.